

Remarks/Arguments

Claims 1, 12, 17, 21, 23, and 25 have been amended to more accurately claim the subject matter disclosed in the present application. Claims 34-42 have been added. Claims have been amended and added in order to more accurately claim the subject matter disclosed in the present application.

No new matter has been added by the present claim amendments. Support for the amendments can be found in the specification as filed. In particular, support for the amendments to claim 1 and 11 can be found at paragraphs 38, 39, 63, and elsewhere in the specification. Support for the amendment to claim 17 can be found at paragraph 43, 44, and elsewhere in the specification. Support for new claims 34-37 and 40 can be found at figure 7, and elsewhere in the specification. Support for new claims 38-39 can be found at figure 3, figure 4, and elsewhere in the specification.

Advisory Action

The Examiner has rejected the response filed March 30, 2007, as failing to place the application in condition for allowance. The Examiner's position is that the prior art rejections as developed in the Final Office Action adequately addressed the claimed limitations as set forth. No new objections or rejections were raised in the Advisory Action.

Accordingly, Applicant will address each of the prior art rejections as developed in the Final Office Action.

35 USC 102

The Examiner has rejected claims 1 to 3, 7, 11 to 13, 15, 21 and 22 as being anticipated by Burdette et al. (US patent number 5956876). Specifically, the Examiner states that Burdette teaches an automated kiosk comprising cabinets, a face frame releasably securable to the cabinet and defining an interface area, a plurality of cross members, at least one of the members secured to the face frame, at least one of the members are releasably securable in a plurality of cross member configurations in relation to the face frame, the cross member configurations dividing the interface area into a plurality of cross member configurations in relation to the face frame and a plurality of hardware components releasably secured to the cross members and positionable within the some areas, wherein the cross member configurations may define various combinations of sub areas of different shapes and sizes depending on the various sizes and shapes of the components to support. The Examiner therefore rejects claims 1 to 3, 7, 11 to 13, 15, 21 and 22, stating that all of the elements of these claims are found within, and anticipated by, Burdette.

Applicant respectfully traverses.

Burdette does not teach cross members releasably securable in a plurality of cross member configurations in relation to the face frame, said cross member configurations dividing the opening defined by a face frame into a plurality of sub-openings. The Examiner contends that a plurality of cross member configurations in relation to the face frame is taught, and contends that this plurality of cross member configurations is disclosed as the "other rigid connection means that can secure the members to the face frame brackets i.e. configuration of securing the member to the frame may be varied". Burdette does state, at column four, lines 62 to 64, that it is possible to provide a nuts and bolts or other rigid connection means

for detachably mounting the panels to the rest of the frame. As such, applicant agrees with the Examiner that a plurality of connection means that can secure the member to the face frame is taught. However, applicant submits that this does not create a kiosk capable of being reconfigured, i.e. having a plurality of cross member configurations in relation to the face frame. The fact that the cross member may be secured to the frame using different means does not allow the cross member to be secured to the frame in different configurations. The present invention provides for different cross member configurations, such that the cross members can be removed and reattached in different configurations in relation to the face frame, (i.e. different locations on the face frame) to provide openings of different sizes. Nowhere is this taught in Burdette. This is further elucidated in the amendments to claim 1, wherein the kiosk is further characterized as having at least two configurations, such that, in one configuration, at least one of a plurality of first hardware components... having a first front face... can be releasably secured to the cabinet by affixing the hardware component to [the cross members or face frame], and, in a second configuration, at least one of a plurality of second hardware components having a second front face of a size that is different than the first front face [of the first hardware component] can be connected.

The Examiner has rejected claims 4, 5 and 28 as being unpatentable over Burdette et al., stating that these claims would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made given the teachings of Burdette. Applicant respectfully traverses. Applicant respectfully submits that this obviousness rejection with regards to claim 4, 5 and 28 is contingent on the novelty objection presented above for claim 1 to 3, 7, 11 to 13, 15, 21 and 22. Therefore, applicant submits that this rejection is traversed with the arguments presented above.